America's Only Monthly Revisionist Newsletter

Smith's Report

ON THE HOLOCAUST CONTROVERSY

71

Number ~~XI~~ WWW.CODOH.COM August 2000

Win one, Lose one

Bradley R. Smith

The simplest way to say this is to just say it. I have had to kill *The Revisionist*. **TR** was not paying for itself, I can't expect the readers of *Smith's Report* to pay for it on top of the contributions you are already making, there is no other source of income to pay for it, so it's gone. I made an error of judgment.

From this point on your subscription will consist of eleven issues of **SR** per year—as before. There will be some of you who subscribed to *Smith's Report* with the understanding that you would receive six issues of *The Revisionist* and five issues of **SR**, and who are going to be disappointed, if not considerably annoyed, by this turn of events. My obligation here is clear: I will refund your price of subscription, or whatever part of your subscription I owe you, and I do it gladly, no questions asked.

Some of you, however, will bear with me through this dispiriting moment. Because of that, I will not begin sending out refunds willy-nilly to everyone who has come on board over the last months. If you decide you do not want to continue to receive *Smith's Report* **without** *The Revisionist*, drop me a card saying so, tell me how much you think I owe you, and a check will wing its way to you within one working week.

THIS IS WHAT HAPPENED.

I knew up front that my irregular cash

(Continued on page 6)

Summer Reading

Finkelstein & Shermer/Grobman

George Brewer

Ever since Paul Rassinier began writing his lonely revisionist classics in postwar France, Holocaust revisionism has always comprised two threads: threads, which comprise in effect two completely different histories. The first is the history of what actually happened to the Jewish people as a result of Nazi persecution in World War Two. The second is the history of the exploitation of that persecution for financial and political gain.

These two types of history frequently get confused, even in the minds of revisionists. The reason is that most revisionists are not drawn to the subject of revisionism out of any particular interest in researching Nazi atrocities—or alleged Nazi atrocities. Rather, most revisionists get involved because they are exposed to the relentless abuse of the Holocaust in the service of various types of leverage in their day to day lives. They become curious, and then find themselves face to face with the factual deficiencies of the traditional Holocaust story.

As a result, the growth of modern Holocaust revisionism since the 1970's has always had a certain combative and confrontational tone, not because of the factual problems involved but because of the exploitation of the tragedy by the endless series of self-proclaimed Jewish agencies (including the Jewish state) which have appropriated the event for their own profit.

Nevertheless, we have to keep in mind that the two threads are not the same. If most revisionists were originally drawn to revisionism by the grotesque exploitation

(Continued on page 2)

LETTERS

Self-Censorship

Like many people I have wondered why Zionism tolerates you. I mean, why they don't try to kill you. Now I think I know.

My Adiabatic Principle: "Any information made public slowly enough will have negligible influence on society." Bill Clinton has been a master practitioner of this principle.

With the end of the Cold War, it is inevitable that the truth about WWII will emerge. Zionism wants only that it emerge slowly. Twenty-five years from now, people will take all this stuff for granted. They will say, "Revisionist claims are old news. Some of them are true. Others, who knows?"

In these terms, you function as a safety valve for this Empire. Also, it is not necessary to use censorship in a prosperous society. Self-censorship is more effective. By self-censorship I mean the sheer *inability* of people to entertain the claims that revisionists make. In a sense, this self-censorship is what your *Confessions* (Volume I) is about.

J. G. [Via email]

You're right about self-censorship and Confessions. *That's what I had to overcome to write (publicly) that I no longer believed what I no longer believed.*

Print our addresses.

Why don't you print the addresses of the people whose letters you print in *Smith's Report*? It would let the Holocaust Lobby see how many of us are willing to be public, and a chance to correspond with each other as well. There may be two or three revisionists in this small town of Trevose that I don't even know.

Joseph Orolin
4913 Central Ave.
Trevose, PA 19053

All right. I've never done this. If anyone wants his mailing address printed in SR, send it along.

Why is it taking so long?

Revisionists have nailed down almost every issue regarding the Holocaust controversy. It should have never have been this difficult. What is the human flaw that has made the hoax so successful? I must admit I don't know.

Perhaps it's the "Asch" effect named after the Polish-Jewish-American psychologist—Solomon Asch—who demonstrated with repeated testing that a high percentage of people will agree with a majority view even when all their senses tell them that the majority is completely wrong. If we don't figure out what this is all about, we are probably doomed as a species.

Fritz Berg (via the CODOH bbs)

Nevertheless.

Your work is outstanding and I would love to continue to support it, but I cannot. I am 86, a poor pensioner, and must deprive myself of everything but the barest necessities. I thank you for your mailings, but can no longer subscribe. Please understand. May your work prosper!

Oscar Grussendorf, Manitoba

Thanks for taking the trouble to write. Your subscription is free.

A good suggestion.

Received the latest – good work!. What do you think about enclosing the E-mail and USPO addresses in **SR** of student newspapers? Perhaps revisionists would write in support.

Harvey Taylor, CA

*Harvey—you are prescient! See our article in this issue of **SR** on our upcoming letter writing campaign. You will be one of the best.*

(Continued from page 1)

of "Shoah Business," it should be clear that the exploitation of the Holocaust has little to do with the actual events thereof. One can oppose the exploitation of the Holocaust without questioning the "facts" of the Holocaust. In the same way, one should be able to dispute the tawdriness of many Holocaust legends without at the same time adopting a political judgment about the current exploitation of that tragedy.

Two new books make it clear just how much these two historical threads are in fact independent of each other. One, *Denying History* by Michael Shermer and Alex Grobman, tries to engage the issue of factual distortions in the Holocaust record. Not surprisingly, this reactionary production yields not one inch concerning the absurdities and falsehoods that permeate the historical record. The second book, Norman Finkelstein's *Holocaust Industry*, is a ruthless expose of the way in which the self-appointed industry has turned the sacred cow of Jewish suffering into a golden calf of profit, endlessly bilking non-Jewish states for monies, while at the same time keeping most of the funds for themselves. Shermer and Grobman's book makes it clear just how much resistance revisionists have yet to overcome in order to set the historical record straight. Finkelstein's book, on the other hand, shows that the other strand of revisionism has finally worked its way decisively into the mainstream.

SHERMER'S CHOICE

Of the two offerings, by far the weakest is the effort of Michael Shermer, an adjunct professor at Occidental College, but who is best known for his advocacy of the natural highs derived from long-distance bicycle riding. For the

(Continued on page 3)

(Continued from page 2)
present book, Shermer enlisted the aide of Alex Grobman, an operative of the Simon Wiesenthal sponsored "Museum of Tolerance," an institution best known for air-brushing clouds of smoke emanating from a fence post at Auschwitz in a 1944 photograph. Under the circumstances, we feel justified in focusing on Shermer alone.

Although promised as a final expose of revisionists, and the Final Proof of the Holocaust, Shermer does little more in his book than to repeat the vapid arguments of his 1997 effort, *Why People Believe Weird Things*. (Contrary to what you might think, this book was not about those who believe in the Holocaust.)

For example, Shermer once again harps on the idea of the "convergence of evidence," a theoretical situation in which numerous types of evidence from different sources are said to "converge" on the truth of "the Holocaust." What this means, for example, is that we "know" that gassings occurred at Auschwitz because we have, say, seventeen pieces of evidence that say so. On close analysis this evidence consists of fourteen postwar affidavits before courts committed to the idea that gassings occurred, and three photos. Moreover, what do these photos consist of? Well, there's an aerial photo of the crematoria. There's another one that shows four dark splotches on the roof of a morgue. There's yet another that shows three white boxes on the roof of the morgue. That's enough for Shermer: there were gassings at Auschwitz.

What seems to elude Shermer in all of this is that the factuality of gassing at Auschwitz was an accepted fact in the wartime media long before anyone ever testified to that fact. In the same way, the photos that he tendentiously interprets were dragged from obscurity decades after the war with the precise purpose of supporting the sagging mass-gassing claim. One could just as well prove the "convergence of evidence" for UFO landings at Roswell with some testimonies, an aerial photo of the desert, and a street map of Tucson.

Perhaps bothered a bit by the lameness of his evidence, Shermer spends most of his time engaged in the amateur psychologizing of many leading revisionists, including Mark Weber, Robert Faurisson, Arthur Butz, and David Irving. The personal nature of these descriptions have absolutely nothing to do with the factuality of any aspect of the Holocaust itself, but do enable Shermer to marginalize revisionists as cranks and antisemites.

In effect, revisionism has won a tremendous victory on this front, although of course revisionists will not soon be credited for it.

Altogether, Shermer's should be judged a complete failure by any reasonable historiographical standard, not least because of its *ad hominem* agenda, but also because it ignores the recent research of Rudolf, Mattogno, Crowell, and several others, who effectively shoot down most of his arguments. Our guess is that he deliberately ignored them. Eventually Shermer will have to deal with the evidence, and not rely on secondary sources as he does here: The result will probably be a great retreat into the deserts of mystical truth, along the lines of Van Pelt's "moral certainty" about what happened at Auschwitz.

FINKELSTEIN'S COMPLAINT

Norman Finkelstein's "Holocaust Industry" is a throwback in more than one sense. On the one hand, it falls into that intramural tradition of Jewish criticism in which ordinary Jews decry the corruption and venality of the Jewish power elite. On the other hand, Finkelstein's book is also an extension of the kinds of arguments that Peter Novick made in his *Holocaust in American Life*.

Novick's book was essentially a historical description of how the Jewish catastrophe was first submerged, and then only slowly manipulated from the 1960's into the full-blown Holocaust industry as we know it today. In this respect, Novick stayed close to his sources, mainly the internal papers of Jewish agencies, and while highly critical of the extent to which the Holocaust cult has spread in the past decade, was generally mute about how the event was abused for political and financial gain. In addition, in a few passages that sullied his intellectual reputation, Novick castigated revisionists with a series of schoolyard epithets.

Compared to Novick, Finkelstein is far more measured but at the same time more explosive. First, he separates out the development of the Holocaust as a cultural shibboleth from the time of the 1967 war. He argues instead that the importance of the Holocaust evolved slightly later, at a time when it was advantageous to America's mostly non-Jewish power structure. At the same time, Finkelstein has no mercy exposing the hoaxers and hucksters (as he calls them) of those who traffic on the Holocaust, including Daniel Goldhagen, Binyamin Wilkomirski, and Elie Wiesel. Finkelstein gleefully exposes the many tall tales of the Yiddish Paul Bunyan, including Wiesel's claim that he was thrown 200 feet after being struck by a New York City cab (a tale commented on in *Smith's Report* several years ago.)

Finkelstein also demonstrates a much greater awareness of revisionist writings, defends David Irving, and points out that Arno Mayer made use of Arthur Butz's book in

(Continued on page 4)

(Continued from page 3)
the writing of *Why Did the Heavens Not Darken?* At the same time, Finkelstein does not explicitly question any aspects of the traditional Holocaust narrative. While he is certain that the Holocaust "happened," he doesn't endorse any specific claims. For example, there are only two references to gas chambers, both in quotes from Holocaust Industry mouthpieces.

This does not mean, however, that he is necessarily charitable to revisionists. In a surprise twist, Finkelstein argues that the Holocaust Industry, by claiming that they represent about one million survivors, must also therefore admit that the Holocaust could not have claimed the canonical six million lives, and that the process of destruction must have been haphazard. To Finkelstein, this can only mean that the Holocaust Industry, in its relentless greed, has become Holocaust Denial itself. Clearly, Finkelstein seeks here to tarnish the Industry.

Even so, this flaw sets the stage for what is a devastating attack on an Industry run amok. Finkelstein argues that the various agencies, including the WJC and especially Israel Singer and Edgar Bronfman, do not in fact represent any particular constituency among the Jewish people at all. In a frightening description of a cynical campaign of blackmail and media manipulation, Finkelstein also describes in depth how first Switzerland and then Germany caved in to demands for money. Most of these extorted funds will never end up in the pockets of survivors, according to Finkelstein, because they will all soon be dead—which raises the interesting question of where all these billions will in fact end up.

In his closing pages, Finkelstein outlines the current behind-the-scenes campaign to completely recover all Jewish assets that were lost, stolen, or appropriated in Eastern Europe during or after World War Two, capping his exposition with a typically outrageous quote from Israel Singer: "50% of American art is looted Jewish art." Truly, as Finkelstein observes, "the Holocaust industry has clearly gone berserk."

From a historiographical point of view, Finkelstein's latest book has no great merit. It is highly polemical and makes no apologies for its ranting tone. In addition, there is an obvious personal bias involved here. Finkelstein's parents were both survivors. His father spent some time at Auschwitz, while his mother was deported from Warsaw after the 1943 uprising and was sent to Majdanek and several other camps. It is clear from his other writings that Finkelstein venerates the memory of his parents, and is angered by the *kitsch* and sloppiness of so much Holocaust memorabilia.

"It's not about the money," said a Swiss negotiator resignedly a while back, "It's about more money."

On the other hand, Finkelstein's narrative of Jewish groups strong-arming European governments by skillful propaganda is chilling. There are those revisionists who claim that Finkelstein only seeks to distance the Jewish people from the backlash that these extortion campaigns are likely to engender. Given the grotesque descriptions in this short book, it is not hard to see why someone might fear the growth of anti-semitism in the wake of these campaigns. But ideology and the Holocaust are not really the central themes of this book, but rather something more timeless: Greed.

"It's not about the money," said a Swiss negotiator resignedly a while back, "It's about more money."

CONCLUSION

The books of Shermer and Finkelstein are not merely at the top of anyone's list of books to read at the beach this summer. They also represent an alpha and omega of the state of current Holocaust writings, and what is potentially a very valuable split in the process. Shermer represents the traditional wing of Holocaust "scholarship" that is becoming progressively detached from any rational factual analysis and more and more concerned with irrelevancies. It is not that personal attacks are meaningless, it is rather that anyone wanting to know the facts of the Holocaust will not get very far with the likes of Shermer. On the contrary, at this point, there is more consistent and inarguable historical fact in a few pages of several revisionist authors than there is in Shermer's entire book. What this means is that in the future interested students will turn more and more to revisionist treatments simply by default.

On the other hand, Finkelstein's book, along with Novick's treatment from a year ago, and several other books over the years (Garaudy, Segev, Lilienthal) has effectively mainstreamed once and for all the long standing revisionist claim that the Holocaust had been appropriated for financial and political gain.

In effect, revisionism has won a tremendous victory on this front, although of course revisionists will not soon be credited for it.

Some revisionists have expressed disappointment with this state of affairs, and view Finkelstein's book as part of a Jewish "strategy" to defuse Holocaust debates. However, this is not only doubtful, it fails to recognize the real constructive merit of books like Finkelstein's. The sooner the revisionist ideas of Novick and Finkelstein become common coin, the sooner the gargantuan cultural scope of the Holocaust will shrink

(Continued on page 5)

(Continued from page 4)
to a size appropriate to a sixty year old tragedy. Once this happens, the Holocaust will be viewed as an event like any other. At that point, no amount of Shermer-like smokescreens will be able to deter the establishment from seeing that, on the facts, the revisionists were right all along.

Hence, it is important to recognize that Finkelstein's book represents a necessary halfway house on the road to the final depoliticization of the Holocaust, just as Shermer's book (and Van Pelt's expert report for the Irving trial) represents the last gasp of reactionary obscurantism. We should all take heart from the current situation.

[*George Brewer is the editor of* The Revisionist Online. *He was formally editor of the print edition of* The Revisionist]

Supporting Student Editors

As I write this it is too early to tell if enough contributions will come in this month to pull Bradley out of his financial hole, but early indications are that he'll come close. Thank you, everyone, who pitched in to help. By making his life easier you make mine easier as well. It's very difficult for Bradley to stay focused and on track when he keeps staring at his check register.

Several times since coming to work for CODOH I have heard Bradley express some amazement at the results he gets when he asks people to work as volunteers. As an example, CODOH has two tireless teams of volunteers who are going to help make the next academic year most exciting. One family team provides Bradley with the names and addresses of professors on any campus, usually within 24 hours of his request. This information allows us to follow up on campus stories and to challenge professors who deny intellectual freedom to their students.

The other husband and wife team has amassed hundreds of email addresses for news media, student editors, journalists, student organizations, Arab newspapers and professors of journalism, history, psychology, etc. (This last, psychology, is going to be most fun. Bradley wants to offer "eyewitness survivor testimony" to professors for analysis.) All of these addresses will be used in the upcoming academic year to notify recipients across the country where CODOH advertisements are running and to follow up with relevant press releases. Our friends on the other side won't know what hit them! Little of this would have been possible without these CODOH volunteers. Bradley can't get half of his projects completed on his own, and even with my help we wouldn't have had the time or the expertise to gather so many addresses. Which leads me to an idea.

Whenever Bradley asks for help he generally receives it, but he rarely thinks to ask. So I'm going to ask. It would be fabulous if we could have volunteers across the country who would be willing to write letters of support to student editors who run CODOH ads. These editors *always* get beat up unmercifully by their faculty and the usual special interest groups. When the San Diego State University *Daily Aztec* ran our "Holocaust Studies" ad this last term the paper refused to print a letter to the editor from Bradley. It did, however, print two pro-revisionist letters from writers in Pennsylvania and Ohio. Bradley lives 50 miles from San Diego and couldn't get published, but supporters 2,000 miles away were very effective in both supporting the editors and challenging the professors.

We need to encourage student editors and let them know that they are not alone, that they are appreciated by those of us who support intellectual freedom. We need to counter-act the irrational criticism, hateful accusations and demeaning verbiage which is heaped upon them. We need to take the professors to task for actively denying intellectual freedom for our best and brightest.

If you would like to volunteer as an independent letter writer let us know. I will notify you every time an ad runs and give you the information you will need to follow the story and respond to it. Bradley will get the ball rolling with his ads, then CODOH volunteers will carry the campaign forward. With a few hundred foot soldiers strategically placed across the nation, well armed with facts, good sense and a love of freedom, we will be able to encourage student editors to stand up and fight. We could bring thousands of new people to CODOHWeb – the best Holocaust revisionist Internet site in the world. That's called leverage. Let the ADL have their millions of dollars! We have the truth.

If you would like to volunteer for this campaign, please fill out the enclosed information form and send it to my attention – Audrey. This information will be kept private, as always. You probably know that when you write a letter to the editor, typically, the paper will want to have your phone number so that they can confirm for themselves whose letter they are printing. You will write as an independent citizen, not as a representative of CODOH. We will not even know what or to whom you write. If, however, your letter is published we would like to have a clipping or copy of it for our files, or for reproducing in *Smith's Report.*

We will form a database of volunteers who I will then be able to contact at the drop of a hat, and with the strokes of a few hundred

(Continued on page 6)

(Continued from page 5)

pens we'll put the other side on their ears! (How's that for a string of unrelated idioms?) Seriously though, this project could have a significant impact on the Industry, send Mr. Foxman of the ADL into a tizzy, and increase the revisionist presence across the country the entire academic year. This will be enjoyable, rewarding and productive – the CODOH grass-roots movement in action!

So what do you say? Are you with us? If you are, let's synchronize our watches for Operation Campus Project. Bradley will carry the colors and together we will carry the day.

Never surrender!

Audrey

(Continued from page 1)

flow would not cover the costs of putting the magazine together, printing, distribution to subscribers, and the insertion of **TR** into student newspapers – which was my main priority. I convinced myself, after a great deal of back and forth with my volunteer advisors, some of whom told me straight out that I didn't have a chance, that I could distribute tens of thousands of **TR** through college and university newspapers, and that I would receive enough subscriptions and contributions to publish **TR** on a regular basis.

The figure I had in the back of my mind was very modest -- a one percent response. That is, with each 10,000 copies of TR that I was able to distribute on college campuses, those 100 individuals would subscribe. At $29 per sub, that would mean a $2,900 return, gross. I believed I could distribute many more than 10,000 copies in student newspapers, and that while there would not be (again) much profit, that it would forward the Campus Project and take many more students and faculty to our Website, CODOHWeb – which is where it's at – everything.

Of course, there were also the costs of shipping and inserting **TR** -- anywhere from 1,500 (Dickinson College) to 15,000 (San Diego State U). These costs would about equal the costs of printing, and could exceed it. To cover those costs I was counting on two, perhaps three percent of the new subscribers to become contributors. A rather ambitious, speculative plan, but I thought the idea so good, that it could be so effective if it worked, that I came to the place where I felt *obligated* to take a run at it.

As it happened, during the 1999 - 2000 academic year I was able to distribute 43,000 copies of the various issues of *The Revisionist*. If I were to have received a one- percent response, 430 subscriptions, that would have brought in a minimum of $12,470 in subscription monies alone – not counting contributions above the price of the sub, which could easily have doubled it. It is with contributions, not subscriptions, that I have been able to keep this ship afloat the last ten years. If I had gotten one-half of one percent, I could probably have continued publishing the magazine.

But I didn't. There was almost no financial response from the campus whatever. There were plenty of fireworks, we got a lot of press, the accessing of documents on CODOHWeb increased dramatically, but there was almost no money. That's how it is when you're ahead of your time (he says modestly). There is no market for what we are selling. Our time is coming, there's no doubt about it, we can see it coming on every side, but it is still on the horizon. That's just the fact of the matter.

This is the story then. I had a dramatic concept, I put together a good team to carry it out, we published four issues of *The Revisionist*, including the special Campus Edition following issue number two, but I failed to find a way to raise enough money to keep it going -- so – rather than going further into debt I folded the magazine. That's how it goes with revisionism. Win one, lose one. It's like life that way.

If I owe you a refund, please drop me a line saying so and I'll send it along. Meanwhile, from this date forward – 27 July 2000 -- any monies received from new subscribers specifically for *The Revisionist* will be returned, along with a sample copy of *Smith's Report* and a new order form.

Last fall when I first announced *The Revisionist* and asked for help with getting it off the ground, a number of you responded with generous contributions. I want to thank each one of you now – if I have not before. Your contributions were not wasted. Campus editors at more than 1,000 colleges and universities received copies of **TR**. Forty thousand-plus students and faculty at Hofstra U, Valdosta U (GA), St Cloud U (MN), Boise State U, Wake Forest U, and San Diego State U and Dickinson College (PA) received copies of **TR**. Hardly any of them had ever seen anything like it. And every one who had any interest in the subject whatever went to CODOHWeb where 20,000 to 30,000 documents were being accessed *daily!*

In short, we did quite well with the resources we had. It wasn't good enough. We had **TR** 4 written and formatted and were just cleaning it up for the printer when I saw the light. It was emanating from my checkbook. The message was: "You are going into debt. You are already in debt but you are about to dive for the bottom. " I didn't like what was being revealed to me. Three years ago this month I went bankrupt and escaped to Mex-

(Continued on page 7)

(Continued from page 6)

ico. If I go bankrupt in Mexico, where is there to go? The Guatemalan jungle? Tierra del Fuego. I'm glad I took a run at the print version of *The Revisionist*, and now I'm glad that I had sense enough to know when to give it up.

THE REVISIONIST HAS NOT DISAPPEARED.

We are going to move *The Revisionist* onto the Internet on CODOHWeb. It's already there in a simplified form. Richard Widmann, the managing editor of the Website, has been placing articles from the printed version of **TR** on the Web since last fall. The Web version of **TR** is not a full magazine at this time, but our plan is to make it one. While we will lose many of the advantages of a print magazine, which remains the most influential form in which to publish radical intellectual work, there are advantages to publishing on the Web that I had not fully considered – until circumstances forced me to.

THE IDEA IN A NUTSHELL

Publishing on the World Wide Web costs (almost) nothing. I will still have the costs of producing and editing the text, some of which I have been paying from the beginning. But there is no cost to print, no postage, and no insertion costs. The downside here is that there will be no subscription fees – but I was not getting those in any event so I am not giving up anything.

First, we have to develop a "Web" concept for the Online magazine, then the concept has to be worked out technically by our Webmaster David Thomas. He has a life, so he has to do this in his spare time. The editorship will remain with George Brewer, who you will remember from past issues of **TR,** and from the lead article in **SR**70 regarding the new Crowell manuscript.

Once we have the Web concept for *The Revisionist* online worked out, it will be my job to promote it through the Internet to academia and to the press, on and off campus, all over the country – and beyond our borders. This is where the advantages of Web publishing begin to come to the fore. I'm an old guy, I still think in terms of print. Five years ago the World Wide Web was a mere babe compared to what it is now, and what it is now is very modest compared to what it will be in another five years. We're sitting pretty. I'm still learning how to think about the Internet conceptually. Because we are ahead of our time, and there is so little funding, there will be substantial managerial issues to deal with, particularly with my search for volunteers to carry the workload. But I think we are sitting pretty.

The only downside to getting **TR** on to the World Wide Web and making a connection with media all over the English speaking world is the disappointment that our friends in the Holocaust Industry will have to suffer. I'm sorry about that, but again, this is life. Win one, lose one.

CODOH &VHO
Form Web Partnership

Richard Widmann

CODOH has broken new ground once again on the World Wide Web by establishing an unprecedented (for revisionists) partnership with VHO (*Vrij Historisch Onderzoek*). The VHO is the leading revisionist organization and publisher in Europe. It is responsible for the foremost revisionist periodical in the world today, *Vierteljahreshefte fuer freie Geschichtsforschung* (VffG) which is now in its fourth year.

Over recent months CODOH Webmasters, David Thomas and Richard Widmann have met with Germar Rudolf, the German revisionist scientist and Webmaster of the VHO Website. Rudolf had a number of ideas about how to improve the technical organization of CODOHWeb. CODOH established one of the first revisionist Websites and it has grown tremendously over the past five years. In some respects, it had outgrown its initial organizational structure. Sometimes important articles and authors had become difficult to find for those not intimately aware of the site's structure. Rudolf, a master of organization, recommended the use of a "navigation bar" on all of CODOH's Web pages. This navigation bar, an organizational tool, would allow those who visit our pages too much more easily search and find the information that they are looking for.

In addition, Rudolf suggested that VHO and CODOH form a partnership of sorts on the Web, where our new navigation bar not only brings order to CODOHWeb but also links to the various files of VHO. In return, Rudolf modified the VHO navigation bar to include links to all of CODOH's files. This new partnership benefits both organizations by reducing the need for redundant posting of articles. Revisionist and non-revisionist researchers alike can use the search capabilities that have been established and quickly find what they are looking for whether its on CODOHWeb or the VHO site. This partnership brings the foremost English language revisionist Website, CODOHWeb, together with the foremost European revisionist Website, VHO.

CODOHWeb is sure to see an even higher number of visits as now the visitors to VHO can easily jump to CODOHWeb and vice versa. The VHO site has a large number of articles in German and French, as well as other European languages. Although CODOH has long featured articles in various languages on our CODOH International page, the articles of VHO add an incredible wealth of information for our

non-English readers.

The VHO site includes regular postings from 21 different revisionist journals including VffG, *Deutschland* in *Geschichte und Gegenwart* and *Akribeia*. The site also has posted 45 major revisionist books including the forthcoming English version of *Grundlagen zur Zeitgeschichte*, (*Dissecting the Holocaust*). VHO, like CODOH, is always breaking new ground. VHO, for example, has just posted the entire *Leuchter Report* in Dutch! In the very near future we expect much more to come of this partnership. Example: we are working together to establish a complete author's index and subject index of the materials on both sites. There is almost no limit to the possibilities before us.

Last year, *Smith's Report* published an interview that we did with Germar Rudolf (see **SR** 64). In that interview, Rudolf proclaimed "Holocaust revisionism must succeed in the world's leading nation, the United States, or it will never succeed." We at CODOH and VHO believe that this recent partnership of ideas and technology brings us closer to that goal.

OTHER STUFF

One morning I was driving a couple people north across the border at Tijuana and was stuck in a long line of cars. One of my passengers bought a toy Chihuahua from a street vender and gave it to me. It was about the size of my thumb. It had a sticker on its bottom that you peel off so you can stick the dog to the dashboard. As you drive along the dog's head bobs and wags. It's a very silly little toy, but I liked it.

After a week the Chihuahua would no longer stick to the dash and kept tumbling around. I should have tossed it, it's a little piece of junk, but I found a green pushpin and put it through one of the Chihuahua's paws, pinning it to the vinyl dashboard. As I pushed in the pin, something moved in my heart.

At that instant I saw a window open in my mind and before thought had time to consider what it revealed a second window had opened. And then they were both gone. From beginning to end both windows opened and disappeared in a fraction of a second. But the images of what were in the windows remained clear in memory.

In the first window I had seen myself standing on the doorstep of an apartment in Hollywood where I was about to knock on the door of a lady who was waiting for me. It was a fall evening in 1966. At that moment I noticed that there was a worm on the concrete landing near her doorsill and that I was about to step on it. I saw myself draw my foot back.

In the second window I saw myself standing on the deck of a WWII Victory ship off the coast of South Vietnam. I was watching American jets making napalm runs on what were probably some bunkers along the shoreline. It was the same year, 1966. I'd been working on a tramp, a WW II Victory, and we had steamed around the South China sea for three months unloading and picking up cargo in Vietnam, Thailand, Taiwan, the Philippines and so on.

It was lunch hour and some of the crew was out on deck with me, some still eating lunch, and they were whooping it up and cheering on the planes. I was watching, but I wasn't cheering. I was familiar with napalm from Korea fifteen years earlier. Seeing it again, the exploding sheets of liquid flame, left me very quiet. After awhile I became aware that while I was watching the napalm runs I was eating a tuna fish sandwich. It was on white bread. I went back inside the mid-ship house to the mess. I could hear the shouting and laughing out on deck. When I started to take a bite from the tuna fish sandwich, something stopped me. I watched myself throw it in the garbage.

It makes you wonder. In Baja, Mexico you push a pin through the paw of a plastic Chihuahua and in that instant, with the speed of light as they say, thought opens two windows in the mind and you see yourself thirty-four years earlier in Hollywood being careful to not step on a worm, and then off the coast of South Vietnam watching the beauty and horror of a napalm run and deciding you will not finish eating a tuna fish sandwich.

If that's the way thought works, and it is, it does not bode well, say, for the peace process in the Middle East. Imagine what the movement of thought must be in the minds of angry and frustrated men. Imagine how thought feeds on itself through memory, using it in one combination after another, endlessly, inside the brains of millions of Palestinians and Israelis. Imagine what a mess it must be in there. Never forget!

THE LAST WORD

I very much appreciate the generous contributions so many of you made in response to Audrey's "Paul Revere" appeal for funds last month. The money issue is no laughing matter for me. This is a business that is not a business, and which for me will not become one. There's not enough time left. We are all still too far ahead of the curve. Nevertheless, it's life, which I appear to feel is better than the alternative.

Thanks.

Bradley

Smith's Report

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)

For your contribution of $29 you will receive eleven issues of *Smith's Report*
[$35 Canada and Mexico
$39 overseas]

All checks and correspondence to

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Diego, CA 92143

T & F: 858 309 4385
Voice Mail: 619 687 1950

E-mail: CODOHMail@aol.com

www.codoh.com